DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 484 CG 021 617

TITLE	Helping Hands: Effective Programs for At-Risk Students in Virginia.
INSTITUTION	Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, W. Va.; Virginia Education Association, Richmond.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 88
CONTRACT	400-86-0001
NOTE	41p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325 ($5.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Dropout Prevention; Elementary Secondary Education; *High Risk Students; Intervention; Potential Dropouts; *Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The Virginia Education Association and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory jointly sponsored a group of six educators to study descriptions of over 100 programs for at-risk students in Virginia public schools. The group developed a Survey of Programs for At-Risk Students that called for an extensive program description and mailed the survey to the identified programs. Forty-three responses to the survey were returned and reviewed by the group. Eighteen programs met the criteria of providing a description of program activities or interventions, a description of evaluation results or effectiveness measures, congruence between the stated goals and interventions described, inclusion of activities that differed from the regular school curriculum, focus on in-school strategies rather than programs for youths not currently enrolled, and evidence of program credibility and enthusiasm for the program on the part of the respondents. This document summarizes characteristics of the 18 programs in these topic areas: goals and objectives; major program activities; types and frequency of instruction; staff development; program funding; program staffing; program histories; program plans for the future; measures of program effectiveness; withdrawals from programs; and major program accomplishments. The programs are listed with contact persons and brief descriptions, and grouped by educational level. A bibliography is included. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306484

VEA-AEL

Helping Hands: Effective Programs for At-Risk Students in Virginia

A Joint Study by the

Virginia Education Association
116 South Third Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

and the

AEL

Appalachia Educational Laboratory
September 1988

CG 021617

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Funded by

OERI

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U. S. Department of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn Slack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Helping Hands: Effective Programs for At-Risk Students in Virginia

A Joint Study by

The Virginia Education Association
and the
Appalachia Educational Laboratory

September 1988

Funded by the

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U. S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

The Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL), Inc., works with educators in ongoing R & D-based efforts to improve education and educational opportunity. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. It also operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. AEL works to improve:

- professional quality,
- curriculum and instruction,
- community support, and
- opportunity for access to quality education by all children.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling **AEL,** Post Office Box 1348, Charleston, West Virginia 25325; 800/624-9120 (outside WV), 800/344-6646 (in WV), and 347-0400 (local).

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number 400-86-0001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U. S. Government.

These materials are issued in draft form for developmental purposes.

AEL is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Acknowledgements

The Virginia Education Association and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory wish to thank the following educators who contributed to this publication. Their time and efforts in survey development, location of exemplary programs, writing, and editing are much appreciated.

Joanne Blanton
Caroline County Public Schools

Dale Brittle
Caroline County Public Schools

Carolyn Cummings
Richmond City Public Schools

Eva DePue
Caroline County Public Schools

Sherrell Sherron
Chesterfield County Public Schools

Clover Willis
Richmond City Public Schools

Helen Rolfe
Virginia Education Association

Appalachia Educational Laboratory Staff:

Pat Cahape
Pam Coe
Jane Hange
Shirley Keene
Carolyn Luzader

Executive Summary

The Virginia Education Association and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory jointly sponsored during 1988 a study group of six educators, facilitated by VEA and AEL staff, who studied descriptions of over 100 programs for at-risk students in Virginia public schools, selected those that appeared to be most effective on the basis of program staff responses to an extensive questionnaire, and summarized key program features in this publication. Eighteen Virginia programs, serving students from the prekindergarten through the secondary level, are examined in-depth.

The programs represent a broad range in the kinds of at-risk students who are served and the environments (urban, suburban, and rural) in which they are served. Some have been in existence for more than 15 years, while others were inaugurated in 1987-88. All have some evidence that they meet the needs of the students they serve, and all plan to continue. Most anticipate improving their programs by serving more students, perhaps at more grade levels, and adding additional services.

Because the range of programs is so great, this publication cannot provide educators with a "how-to-do-it" formula for establishing a successful program for at-risk students. It can, however, present a wide range of possibilities and spark educators' creative planning capabilities as they consider the needs of students who are most at-risk in their own school systems. Educators can determine which programs described here have the most to offer the students they either wish to serve or are currently serving. Educators are urged to consult the program contact person listed for each program in "Program Descriptions and Contact Information," pp. 13-15, for more in-depth information and consultation.

All the programs described here have interventions planned to meet the needs of the particular type of at-risk student they serve. None tries to meet the needs of all at-risk students. Several, targeted to assist elementary school children, adopt the strategy of giving students highly positive school experiences and preventing them from becoming potential dropouts. Redirecting students' energies into positive channels appears to be a winning strategy at the high school level. Some programs provide full-day educational programs for at-risk students, while others are in contact with students for as little as two hours per week. Some have enough school personnel to give every student a great deal of personal attention, with small classes and often individual counseling. Others rely on a relatively small volunteer staff. All manage to provide a high degree of personal contact, caring, and encouragement.

We hope that the description of these programs and their accomplishments will encourage all those educators who are doing their best to prevent at-risk young people from wasting their potential. We hope it will motivate others to consider whether there are at-risk students in their school system whose needs are not being met and, if so, to develop effective interventions.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION..... page 1
- Planning the Study ..... page 1
- Conducting the Study ..... page 1
- Summary..... page 3
- Help Us Make This Publication Better..... page 3

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES ..... page 4
- Goals and Objectives..... page 4
- Major Program Activities..... page 4
- Types and Frequency of Instruction..... page 5
- Staff Development..... page 7
- Program Funding..... page 7
- Program Staffing..... page 8
- Program Histories..... page 8
- Program Plans for the Future..... page 8
- Measures of Program Effectiveness..... page 9
- Withdrawals from Programs..... page 10
- Major Program Accomplishments..... page 10

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND CONTACT INFORMATION..... page 13

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... page 17

CURRICULUM REFERENCES..... page 21

RESOURCES LIST..... page 23

APPENDICES
- Appendix I: School Nominating Form and Covering Letter
- Appendix II: Survey Form

Introduction

AEL seeks to provide professional development opportunities to educators by working with and through their associations. Since 1985, one way that the Classroom Instruction (CI) program has assisted associations is through the creation of study groups. AEL's purpose for a study group is to assist educators in conducting and using research.

A study group is composed of educators who are organized to conduct a study on an educational issue and who produce a product that is useful to their colleagues. Associations and AEL jointly select topics for study groups, although member selection is completed by associations. AEL staff participate in meetings as members of the study group and usually take a facilitative role. AEL provides a small grant to the association to assist with the study group, but the in-kind contributions that association or individual members often make far exceed AEL's grant. AEL provides additional services, such as editing, layout, and typesetting of the group's final product. The responsibility for dissemination lies with both AEL and the association. Usually AEL provides dissemination to the other three states in its Region, while the association handles the announcement and dissemination of the product in its own state. AEL often provides a small grant to assist with the dissemination of the product or to sponsor opportunities for study group members to share the findings of their study at state or regional conferences.

Planning the Study

During January 1988, Helen Rolfe, Instruction and Professional Development director of the Virginia Education Association (VEA); Madeline Wade, VEA president; and Jane Hange, director of the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) Classroom Instruction program, discussed the formation of a study group focusing on the problems of at-risk students. Both VEA and AEL were beginning to organize multiple professional development opportunities relating to this significant national problem. Rolfe nominated seven Richmond area teachers and counselors from elementary, middle, and secondary school levels to become study group members. One study group member later dropped out.

In their initial meeting, study group members, with Rolfe and Hange, decided to focus on assisting educators to improve education for at-risk students. The group decided to locate exemplary programs for such students in Virginia and to conduct a survey to determine significant program attributes. The group discussed factors associated with students at risk of dropping out of school or failing to achieve up to their potential. For the purposes of the survey and this publication, these factors include one or more retentions in grade, poor attendance, low basic skill test scores, English as a second language, poor interpersonal relationships, being neglected or abused, identification for exceptional education services, poor home-school relations, low academic success, low self-esteem, pregnancy or parenthood, one parent or guardian, low parental educational level, substance abuse (personal or parental), and low socioeconomic status. The group's final product was to be a directory of effective programs for at-risk students in Virginia schools.

Conducting the Study

Seeking programs with proven effectiveness, study group members determined that nomination of model programs by educators in Virginia's 144 public school divisions (districts) was needed. Group members developed a School Nominating Form and cover letter addressed to the chairs of the seven Regional Study Groups of

local division superintendents, requesting that they discuss program nomination in their March meetings of superintendents. (See Appendix I for copies of the nominating form and covering letter.) It was assumed that discussion and consensus reached in the meetings would lead to the nomination of effective programs, defined in the covering letter as addressing one or more of the factors discussed above. The School Nominating Form developed by study group members asked each Regional Study Group to nominate up to three schools at each level—elementary, middle, and high school—where effective school-based programs assisting at-risk students enrolled in school were operating. Very brief descriptions of each program and each school's community were requested, along with the school principal's name. AEL sent a cover letter explaining the project and the School Nominating Form to the seven divisional superintendents chairing the Virginia Regional Study Groups.

Responses to the request for school nominations were received from all regions, but the total number of schools nominated was far fewer than the 63 programs anticipated. To increase the number of programs identified as effective for at-risk students, study group members turned to a compilation of dropout prevention and alternative education programs being developed for statewide distribution by the Virginia Department of Education. Richard Levy, associate director of Middle Schools and Special Programs, supplied one-page program descriptions from over 100 divisions. Levy agreed that the study group's work would not overlap that of the Department, since the VEA directory would provide more complete descriptions of selected programs and would identify exemplary programs, whereas the Department's document would provide more brief descriptions of all programs reporting.

In their April meeting, study group members reviewed all program nominations received from the Regional Study Groups of superintendents and all program descriptions provided by the Virginia Department of Education. The group excluded programs serving students who had previously dropped out and all General Education Degree (GED) programs that were not part of the K-12 curriculum. Group members then identified over 100 programs as worthy of further examination for possible inclusion in the VEA-AEL publication. The study group developed a "Survey of Programs for At-Risk Students" that called for an extensive program description. (See Appendix II for a copy of the survey form.) VEA printed and mailed the survey, with postage-paid return envelopes, to program contact persons and later developed and mailed a followup request to nonrespondents.

The 43 responses to the survey were reviewed by study group members in a June 10 meeting. At this time, the group developed the following criteria for inclusion of a program in their publication:

- description of program activities or interventions,
- description of evaluation results or effectiveness measures,
- congruence between the stated goals and interventions described,
- inclusion of activities that differ from the regular school curriculum,
- focus on in-school strategies rather than programs for youths who are not currently enrolled, and
- evidence of program credibility and enthusiasm for the program on the part of respondents.

Eighteen programs were identified as meeting all the criteria.

Study group members developed an outline for the publication, which involved item analysis of responses to each of the survey's nine sections and reporting of findings within each section. Each member accepted responsibility for one section and worked individually to summarize the 18 responses to her section. AEL staff developed the introductory sections, the program descriptions and contact information, the reference list, and the product evaluation form.

Completed sections were submitted to AEL, where staff copied all sections and mailed all to each member for peer editing. Edited sections were then returned to AEL, where a program staff member melded the sections into one draft.

Study group members, the VEA president and IPD director, and AEL staff reviewed the draft and made final revisions, which were incorporated by the writer/editer. AEL staff then typeset the publication, provided camera-ready masters to VEA, and met with VEA leaders and staff to discuss dissemination of the product in Virginia. AEL announces the publication in its Region and provides copies at cost through its Resource Center.

Summary

While the publication describes a broad range of programs for at-risk students, geographically diverse, it is not a randomly selected group of exemplary programs. All school divisions had an equal opportunity to nominate programs for the study group's consideration, but the response was uneven, and it may be that many fine programs were never considered for inclusion in this publication. We are confident, however, that the programs selected are worthy of attention from any educator involved in work with at-risk students or planning a program for such students. We hope that we may expand this booklet in future editions through identification of more exemplary programs. We also hope that this booklet will provide a means for informal networking among educators working with at-risk students.

Help Us Make This Publication Better

Readers are requested to complete the product evaluation form included within and to fold, staple, and return it to AEL. Suggestions for revisions to the document and/or similar publications are welcomed.

Summary of Survey Responses

The following sections summarize responses of contact persons for the 18 programs selected for inclusion in the "Helping Hands: Effective Programs for At-Risk Students."

Goals and Objectives

Respondents were asked to check their program objectives from a list of descriptors and/or to write in additional objectives. Of the 13 goals and objectives listed on the survey form (see Appendix II), the most frequently selected were: to improve students' self-esteem (13 programs), to lower the dropout rate (13 programs), and to improve the academic performance of at-risk students (13 programs). Other frequently mentioned objectives were to improve attendance (11 programs) and to increase students' self-discipline (11 programs).

Ten programs reported providing counseling assistance or vocational counseling. Less frequently mentioned program objectives included the following: to decrease suspensions (seven programs) and discipline referrals (five programs), to increase parental and community involvement (six programs), to keep pregnant students in school (four programs), to decrease substance abuse (four programs), and to increase English proficiency (three of the 18 programs).

Several respondents described goals and objectives not listed on the survey form. In two school divisions, a major purpose of the programs was to provide peer tutoring as a method for helping at-risk students. Secondary students were to work with students in elementary or middle schools or serve as teacher aides, helping with classroom organization and paperwork. Another program had opportunity for self-expression as an objective. In another, an important goal was to enable students to rejoin their peer groups after retentions put them behind. In yet another, one of the objectives was to provide a peer support group.

Other objectives reported included increasing students' awareness of the resources and assistance available in the community, preparing young people to become competent parents, enhancing students' leadership abilities, and training students to tutor younger students. Objectives of a program for pregnant students were to provide homebound instruction as needed and to provide work experience.

Major Program Activities

Specific program activities varied widely among the 18 programs. Four kinds of major activities can be generally defined: instruction; counseling; field experiences (on-the-job training, assisting younger students, and giving performances); and individualized scheduling to enable students to attain credits toward graduation.

Seventeen of the 18 programs reported offering at least some special instruction or training. Most programs featured relatively small classes (see the section on class size), and at least one provided one-to-one tutoring on a regular basis. Twelve offered instruction in the usual school subjects, frequently at a basic or remedial level. One of these offered especially motivating instruction in only one subject, the arts. Two emphasized vocational instruction, one with on-the-job training. A number of programs offered instruction or training in social skills—for instance, group facilitation or assertiveness training. The three programs that served pregnant teens offered instruction in child development and child care, as well as other survival skills of adult life.

The next most frequently mentioned activity was counseling. Eight programs reported that counseling (individual and/or group) was a major activity. One program consisted entirely of an innovative approach to counseling and procuring needed services for at-risk students. In the five

Physical Education Leadership Training (P.E.L.T.) programs, students were trained to counsel other students with whom they were working. Several of the programs reported that their counseling included attention to meeting students' basic needs, including employment if necessary.

Field experiences were important aspects of several programs. The arts-centered program featured frequent performances, and another program gave students on-the-job training experiences. The five P.E.L.T. programs represented a unique mix of approaches: secondary students were transported to other schools where they tutored other students, provided peer counseling, and acted as group leaders or teacher aides. Sometimes they presented plays or skits for younger students. The students received extensive training (a kind of staff development) to enable them to play these roles, and their performance was rigorously evaluated.

Only two programs reported scheduling as a program activity. They provided individualized scheduling of students' courses to ensure that they had the opportunity to graduate as soon as possible. These students were frequently enrolled in basic courses but did not need special remedial courses.

Clearly, major program activities varied widely to meet the differing needs of the different grade levels served and risk factors addressed. Frequently, at-risk students need academic help to achieve up to their potential; so, it is appropriate that most programs offered some type of instruction targeted to the needs of the at-risk students they served.

Types and Frequency of Instruction

Twelve of the 18 programs described had as their major activity providing special instruction, apart from or in addition to the regular curriculum, for the students they served. One program focused on providing intensive counseling (one-on-one). The five P.E.L.T. programs offered students the opportunity to tutor and serve as teacher aides for younger students and provided them with intensive but not regular training to enable them to play these roles.

In seven programs, students were taught in special classes provided by the program for a full academic day (five hours or more). These classes covered the subjects taught in the normal school curriculum in addition to classes focused on coping skills or vocational courses. At the other extreme, an elementary arts program provided special instruction for one hour twice a week. The program that provided only counseling worked with students in one-hour sessions twice weekly. One program had a special class for students for one hour daily, while two provided two or three hours of special instruction for four or five days per week. The five P.E.L.T. programs had high school students working with younger students for one class period four or five days a week. One school district had night classes for pregnant students rather than using the traditional daytime hours. Students took academic classes for two nights per week (two and one-half hours a night, for a maximum of four classes) and had group counseling sessions and informal instruction on a fourth night, forming a peer support group. One program assigned students to one of four modules, depending on need. Module I provided minimal intervention, with counseling and scheduling but no special classes, while Module IV provided a great deal of support and many special classes.

Various resources and support persons from outside the program staff were used to help implement the program in all but three of the 18 programs. School personnel, such as reading specialists, counselors, psychologists, social workers, public health nurses, and teachers provided most of the help. Some school systems enlisted the aid of persons from outside the district, such as representatives of local businesses, social service clubs and agencies, and area colleges and universities; local artists; dropout prevention and drug abuse specialists; staff or juvenile court services; the extension service; national consultants; speakers on career opportunities; parents; and Department of Human Services staff. In some instances, churches in the community helped the program.

Class size. In the 12 programs that focused on providing instruction, class size was generally small but varied widely, often within

the same program. For instance, one program listed three types of classes: (1) tutoring sessions (one student), (2) classes of about eight students, and (3) classes of about 22. Two programs reported class sizes of fewer than 10 students per class, and 20 was the maximum class size in the remaining nine programs. Of these, three provided class sizes of 15 or under.

Students served. Students served by the 18 programs described were from grade levels preK-12. One program was elementary, one was elementary and middle, two were middle school programs, five were middle school and secondary, six were seconday, and three served students at elementary through secondary levels. Ages of the students ranged from four to 21, with the bulk of the programs serving students in their teens.

Respondents were asked to report their criteria for selecting or enrolling students for a dropout prevention program. The five characteristics reported most frequently were (1) low academic success (10 programs), (2) poor attendance (10 programs), (3) one or more retentions in a grade (nine programs), (4) poor interpersonal skills (eight programs), and (5) pregnancy or being a teenage parent (eight programs). Other criteria cited included low self-esteem, poor home-school relationships, and being a victim of neglect or abuse. Fewer than one quarter of the programs that responded indicated that they used the other traits listed in the survey form as criteria for student selection. (See Appendix II.)

Other characteristics that programs used for student selection (not listed on the survey form but added by respondents) were: student disruptiveness; involvement in the court truancy citation program; referral by a principal, teacher, parent, or guardian; being over age; and planning to drop out.

The number of students served by the programs varied widely, from fewer than 20 to more than 1,000. Four of the 15 programs that responded to this question had fewer than 20 students; five had 20 to 60 students; none had 60-99; four had 100-199 students; one had 200-499; none had 500-1,000; and one program had more than 1,000. The program with more than 1,000 students involved high school students tutoring or serving as teacher aides for other students (a multiplier effect). Since the secondary students worked in elementary, middle, and secondary schools that enrolled primarily low-income and at-risk students, the other students were counted among those served by the program, and the total students served in a quasi-staff capacity.

Curriculum materials. Most of the 18 programs relied primarily on commercially-developed materials rather than a locally-developed curriculum designed for the program. Two programs specified that they used the same texts as used by the general school population, two others reported that there were no special program curriculum materials, and two others did not respond to the question.

Two programs used primarily locally-developed materials. One used *Parenting—the Mother, the Child, a Health Education Curriculum for Continuing Education Program for Pregnant Adolescents,* developed by the Norfolk City school system. The arts-centered program reported that, "The arts coordinator has developed art and dance appreciation materials." Yet another program has used commercially-developed materials as aids in developing a local profile to identify potential dropouts. A program that used both locally-developed and commercial materials reported that it used the *Norfolk Public Schools Senior High School Guidance Program* and *Norfolk Public Schools Teacher Advisor Handbook.* Another used *Building Healthier Youth: A Guide to Health, Safety, and Physical Education, Senior High School, Grades 9-12* by the Health and Physical Education Department of the Norfolk Public Schools.

A wide variety of commercial materials was utilized by the programs. Some of those cited were the Zaner Blozer Modality Preference Test; Writing to Read; Skills for Adolescence; Ungame; Human Development Training Institute materials; Houghton Mifflin Guidance Information System; and Career Materials, Inc., JOB-O.

Other references provided by the various programs are listed in a separate section of the reference list.

Staff Development

All 17 programs that reported on staff development had some type of organized staff development program. A common purpose was to introduce various school constituents (new staff, other teachers in the schools, administrators, parents, etc.) to the program and to orient them to the criteria, goals, and procedures of the programs. Another was to improve the skills of program staff in areas important to the program.

The content of staff development sessions was designed to meet the needs of persons working with the targeted at-risk student population. Thus, programs providing services to elementary school students had different content than those providing services to secondary students, and the three programs serving pregnant teens had very different content from all the others.

In 10 of the 17 reporting programs, staff development took the form of inservice sessions on topics such as suicide prevention, communication, Autoimmune Deficiency Syndrome, drug abuse, nutrition, innovative instructional techniques, and learning styles. One program provided assertiveness training and safety-related instruction. Programs serving pregnant students emphasized topics such as family life education; sex equity for teen mothers; and the academic, physical, and emotional problems of pregnant teenagers.

In the school districts that reported on staff development, the number of inservice sessions varied from one per year to one per week. Some programs provided inservice through weekly staff meetings, while others reported staff meetings as followup to inservice sessions. One program offered a full week of inservice training during the summer, while in another inservice sessions were held in August and again in December. Another offered a four-day workshop prior to the beginning of school. At least five additional programs provided between three and six inservice days per year but did not specify the time of year. One program provided staff development through committee meetings for development of a program handbook, another offered arts workshops, and two more provided staff development through weekly staff meetings. Visits to other schools were a major part of the staff development provided in the five P.E.L.T. programs.

A number of programs emphasized group discussion and sharing in their staff development programs. In most instances (16 of the 17 programs reporting), staff development was conducted primarily or entirely by resource personnel from the school divisions. In addition, two programs noted that staff attended state or national meetings.

Staff involved directly in the various programs were usually required to attend the staff development sessions, and in some cases others in the school division were invited to attend. Four of the programs reported that the inservice sessions were led or presented by teachers in the local school division.

Most programs reported some followup to staff development sessions, primarily through monthly and/or annual meetings or reports. Some programs gave attention "as needed" to programmatic followup. Program evaluation was perceived as followup to staff development by staff of some reporting programs.

While programs reported organizing staff development differently and responding to different needs for staff development, it was an important component of most, if not all, of the programs described here.

Program Funding

Most of the programs (12) were funded solely from local school division sources of income. In addition, two programs listed both state and local sources, one listed state sources, one listed federal sources, and one listed local private sources as their means of funding.The one federally-funded program reported that it would be locally-funded during the next school year. Two programs did not provide funding information.

Amount of annual funding varied greatly from one program to another. It ranged from three programs that required no funding over and above normal school division expenditures

(including transportation), serving 150 at-risk secondary students, to a program in the same division with an annual budget of $560,000 and 16 fulltime professional staff members and one nonprofessional staff. The first of these programs enabled high school students to tutor younger students, and the school division provided transportation. The second was a fulltime alternative education program providing small classes and intensive support to students.

The following chart illustrates the wide range of budgets in the 16 programs providing this information.

Funding Range	Number of Programs
0-$ 5,000	6
$ 6,000-$ 10,000	2
$ 11,000-$ 20,000	1
$ 21,000-$ 30,000	1
$ 31,000-$ 50,000	1
$ 51,000-$100,000	1
$101,000-$200,000	1
$201,000-$400,000	2
$401,000-$600,000	1

Program Staffing

Staffing patterns of the 17 programs that reported this information were as diverse as funding patterns. They ranged from programs that relied entirely on volunteers or fulltime professional staff who assumed extra duties to implement the program to one program that provided training to and affected more than 150 teachers of students working below grade level in a large urban school division.

One program reported only one fulltime support staff member. A number reported one fulltime professional staff supported by various parttime persons (often volunteers). In general, the programs that offered fulltime school programs to at-risk students had the most staff. For instance, one had 16 fulltime professionals and one fulltime support staff, another had eight fulltime professionals and two fulltime support staff, and another had seven fulltime professionals, three fulltime support staff, and a total of nine parttime staff.

Program Histories

The six longest-lived programs were first implemented in the years between 1970 and 1975 and have been in existence for as long as 18 years. One program was first implemented between 1976 and 1980, two were instituted in 1981-82, and one in 1983-84. All of these earlier programs were in urban and suburban areas of Virginia.

One program was instituted in 1984-85, two in 1985-86, one in 1986-87, and four in 1987-88. Five of these more recent programs are rural, perhaps reflecting a growing awareness that there are at-risk students in rural Virginia. During the last school year, 1987-88, four programs were begun, more than in any previous year. They represent a mix: two urban programs, one suburban and rural, and one rural program.

Program Plans for the Future

All 18 programs reported that their programs would be continued in 1988-89.

In response to the question of why the program would or would not be continued, most programs cited their past accomplishments as reasons for continuation. Seven of the 14 responses listed accomplishments, which included the development of major community support. Another four gave two types of reasons: that the need for the program still existed and that the program was meeting its objectives. For instance, one program responded, "Because the program is reaching students who really need help. It helps those students who feel they are nobodies. It enables students to express their inner feelings in a most positive way. It teaches the art of caring, sharing, and validating one another." Three programs cited need alone as the reason for continuing the program.

The survey form asked what improvements, if any, were planned for the program during the

coming year. Thirteen respondents provided descriptions of specific improvements they planned or, in some cases, hoped for.

In four of the programs, the improvements were designed either to maintain the current program level or to expand the existing program. Looking toward program continuation, one response cited, "Development of a pool of teachers to replace those who must leave due to promotions, attrition, etc." An ambitious reason for continuation/improvement was described as institutionalization of an alternative program as part of the school system. This provided for more staff development for program personnel; for program teachers to be invited to all textbook adoption fairs, to be included in academic department meetings and to be evaluated by department chairs; and for the program to offer five periods of instruction in each academic subject per week.

Nine of the programs planned to add new dimensions, either adding additional content or expanding to new grade levels. One program for pregnant teens, for instance, reported that the program had been "adopted" by a local hospital and would use some of the physicians and interns in the program. Staff also hoped to add music to the curriculum. Another program for pregnant teens planned to: "Study the feasibility of implementing a support group for parents of girls participating in the program." Three programs planned to add vocational experiences or to increase their current vocational offerings. Responses from two P.E.L.T. program staffs indicated they had plans for improving this program in which high school students work with younger students. One hoped to add foreign language tutoring at the elementary level and planned to have local universities offer workshops on tutoring in reading and math. The other P.E.L.T. program response stated, "There is always room for improvement, and, as the program grows, more student involvement with planning is needed."

Program plans for the future reflect the vitality of the 18 programs described here. They reflect both the different needs of the various student populations served by these programs and the confidence of program staff that they are on the right track already.

Measures of Program Effectiveness

The survey form (see Appendix II) requested respondents to check areas in which they had evidence of program effectiveness, from a list of descriptors, and to give percentages of improvement, where possible. They were also asked to describe other measures of effectiveness. All programs reported positive changes in at least some measures of program effectiveness, and some cited percentages, for instance, a 20% reduction in the dropout rate.

Fifteen of the 18 programs reported decreased dropout rates, and six reported percentages ranging from a 9.3% decrease for an entire urban school system to a 38.4% decrease in one program. The second most frequently mentioned indicator of program effectiveness was improved attendance, described by 13 programs. Third in reported frequency was a decrease in student suspensions from school, cited in 12 programs, of which four gave specific data. In one program there had been at least a 25% decrease in out-of-school suspensions.

Eleven programs reported that students' grades had improved, and three of them gave percentages of students with improved grades. Ten reported fewer discipline referrals, but only one reported an exact percentage of decline.

Other indicators of program effectiveness included increased parental involvement, cited by six programs. Two respondents specified that they had 50% attendance at meetings for all parents of program students. A seventh program noted that improvement was needed in parental involvement. Four programs reported increases in standardized test scores, and two documented these improvements with percentage increases. One program reported improvement in criterion-referenced test scores.

Some programs described improvement on measures not listed on the survey form, for example, fewer retentions in grade. In one full-day program, "Nearly 90% of students attempting competency tests passed them. Seven of the nine graduates not planning postsecondary education earned a marketable skill." Another

program reported, "Positive image increased; increased enrollment; positive coverage by media; awards for excellence."

Five programs used project-developed evaluation forms as one measure of effectiveness, and two of them provided samples of the forms. Another program noted that the staff would like to see samples of evaluation forms developed by other programs. Three programs have developed case histories as a means of documenting program effectiveness.

Six programs have available written reports with information on various measures of effectiveness, while two more report the availability of student progress reports.

Withdrawals from Programs

Respondents were asked what percentage of students had withdrawn from the program before graduating or completing program requirements. The percentage varied from 0 to 42%. No pattern was apparent in this range. For instance, programs that offered only one or two class sessions were no more likely to report large percentages of withdrawals than full-day programs; and rural programs did not seem to differ from urban programs in this regard.

Reasons given for most withdrawals from the programs were the characteristics of at-risk students cited frequently. They included low self-esteem, lack of interest, poor academic development, poor school climate, child care (need for day care or babysitter), family problems, schedule adjustments, failure to attend assigned jobs, poor grades, lack of parental support, poor attendance, expulsions and suspensions from school, health or medical problems, need for income, pregnancy, and employment. Some students dropped out or moved to another district. One respondent simply stated, "Program didn't meet their needs."

Two programs responded that the question was not applicable to their mode of operation, one reported no withdrawals, and 11 reported less than a 15% withdrawal rate. (Six of these had withdrawal rates of 1-5%.) Four reported withdrawal rates of 20% to 42%. Clearly, most programs did not have high rates of withdrawal.

Major Program Accomplishments

The survey asked respondents to describe the case of a student who achieved particular success in the program or to outline the most effective program strategy.

Successful students. Nine respondents described the effects of their programs on particular students. Successful students changed their behaviors in a number of ways. Attendance improved dramatically in two cases. Absent 57 days during the first semester, one student came to school all but eight days after enrolling in the program. Another student went from missing 38 days the year before entering the program to missing 12 days of school during the current year.

Several students achieved notable academic success. One formerly chronically absent student placed third in a state reading contest. A student who had experienced repeated failure made the highest score among all students in a large urban school system on the math criterion-referenced test. Another brought all of his grades up above C. Many students were reported to have graduated or to have plans to do so.

Improved personal situations and better social integration were other outcomes reported by program leaders. A pregnant teen in one program overcame many personal obstacles and gave birth to a healthy child, successfully completed all requirements for graduation, attended community college, and is currently working. An older student, classified as a ninth grader, worked, went to night school four nights a week, made all B's and C's, and had the credits to graduate in June.

One high school student was described as a troublemaker, who entered the program "with a chip on his shoulder." He had leadership skills, but they were misdirected. After learning interpersonal skills through the P.E.L.T. program and using them in a tutoring program in an elementary school, he developed into what the teacher said was "one of the most outstanding pupils I have ever had. His attitude did an about-face."

Another student was described in "before" and "after" terms. Before the program, he had an arrest record, poor grades and poor attendance, was belligerent and on probation. After enrolling in an urban alternative school, he achieved a final average of C or better in all subjects, had only seven absences all year, caused no trouble all year, was helpful, and had a goal to attend computer school after graduation.

Self-esteem, self-confidence, and poise were also important gains for students in the programs surveyed. A bright young girl described as suffering from low self-esteem because of her father's incarceration became an outstanding leader in her elementary school as a result of participating in the performing arts program. A shy, isolated, and withdrawn student became an outgoing person, a good talker and listener, and eager to participate with others after he established a relationship with another in the program who had similar problems and beliefs.

Program strategies. Effective program strategies that were reported ranged from providing needed health care to high school students' tutoring elementary students. One student's bad teeth and gum problems were corrected through a dental program. Another student's emotional and drug problems were addressed through coordination of court, drug, counseling, and tutoring services.

A tutoring program put students into the "teacher" role. As tutors, the students experienced such problems as rudeness, lack of cooperation, need for discipline, and students who did no homework. Many student-tutors corrected their work habits and personal behavior in their own courses after the "role reversal" experience. Another program provided oppportunities for students to counsel other students. Staff reported that this peer counseling made a difference in the self-esteem of some participants.

An effective strategy for working with chronically absent students was to provide an opportunity for them to make up missed work in an individualized, supportive setting. "Reentering the classroom with made-up, completed assignments gave potential retention/dropout status students a new boost of confidence," reported one program.

In a program for pregnant students, staff reported that an Open House was held each fall for former students and their children. Alumnae were interviewed to learn their current educational and employment status. The information was compiled for an annual report. This program also benefited from outside involvement. A local business sponsored a three-day workshop to help students think through their choices and set goals for one- and five-year periods. The business newsletter has requested employees to volunteer to be matched with students as mentors for the coming year.

These reports of "greatest accomplishments" indicate that success can be achieved with at-risk youth when they receive a high degree of personal contact, intervention, caring, and encouragement. Providing opportunities for students to redirect their energies into positive channels also appears to be a winning strategy.

Program Descriptions and Contact Information

The following programs are represented in the VEA-AEL survey of Programs for At-Risk Students. For more detailed information about a particular program, please write or telephone the contact person listed.

All Grade Levels (Elementary, Middle, and Secondary)

Family Education Center
(grades 5-12) (suburban)
School division: Arlington Public Schools
Address: 3205 South Second Street
Arlington, VA 22204
Telephone: 703/553-8374
Contact person: Joan Johnson
Brief description: The Center is an alternative education center, available by choice, for pregnant teenagers, combining academic courses, pre- and post-natal instruction, and general coping skills.

Petersburg Alternative School
(grades 4-12) (urban)
School division: Petersburg Public Schools
Address: Alternative School
3101 Homestead Drive
Petersburg, VA 23805
Telephone: 804/861-3982
Contact person: Rudy Stephenson
Brief description: The Alternative School provides all required classes, with special attention to basic reading skills and social skills, to potential dropouts.

Systematic Process of Instruction, Remediation, and Acceleration of Learning (SPIRAL)
(grades pre-K-12) (urban)
School division: Norfolk Public Schools
Address: Department of Human Relations and Staff Development
P. O. Box 1357
Norfolk, VA 23501
Telephone: 804/441-2780
Contact person: Ann B. Madison, Director
Brief description: SPIRAL is a full-day program, with small classes, using a creative, practical, interdisciplinary, modality-based instructional approach, emphasizing study skills, self-concept, trust, and high expectations.

Elementary

The Performing Arts Program
(grades pre-K-5) (urban)
School division: Richmond City Schools
Address: Woodville Elementary School
2000 North 28th Street
Richmond, VA 23223
Telephone: 804/780-4821
Contact persons: Jackie Ready, Arts Coordinator, and Leon Harding, Principal
Brief description: Students in a low-income school are exposed intensively to drama, dance, creative writing, choir, and visual arts, in addition to the school system's arts program. Self-confidence arises from the arts disciplines.

Elementary/Middle

Basic Skills Program (grades 4-7) (rural)
School division: Powhatan County Public Schools
Address: Pocahontas Middle School
4290 Anderson Highway
Powhatan, VA 23139
Telephone: 804/598-5720
Contact persons: Meryl Angelo (central office—804/794-4913) and Richard Stewart (Pocahontas Middle School)
Brief description: The Basic Skills program provides one-to-one tutorial assistance in individual subject areas and a supportive environment for students not experiencing success in the traditional classroom.

Middle

Coordinating Counselor Connection (C.C.C.) (grades 6-8) (urban)
School division: Petersburg Public Schools
Address: Peabody Middle School
725 Wesley Street
Petersburg, VA 23805
Telephone: 804/732-0510
Contact person: Nana Bomani, Coordinator of Dropout Prevention
Brief description: The C.C.C. program involves a counselor holding one-hour counseling sessions with at-risk students once or twice a week, utilizing community outreach and inter-agency referrals.

Life Is Fundamental Education (LIFE) (grades 7-9) (rural)
School division: Culpeper County Public Schools
Address: 500 Achievement Drive
Culpeper, VA 22701
Telephone: 703/825-4140
Contact persons: Donald Willard, Principal, and Frederic Babbitt, Assistant Principal
Brief description: The LIFE program provides an alternative, motivational curriculum for at-risk students, with a required career education course and an emphasis on career/survival in science, mathematics, and English courses. LIFE students can be accelerated two grade levels with successful academic and behavioral performance.

Secondary/Middle:

Coronado School (grades 7-12) (urban)
School division: Norfolk Public Schools
Address: 1025 Widgeon Road
Norfolk, VA 23513
Telephone: 804/857-0774
Contact person: Vandelyn S. Whitehurst
Brief description: Coronado is an alternative school for pregnant teenagers, providing required academic courses; special courses in health, physical education, and home economics; homebound instruction as needed; and work experience.

Hopewell-Prince George Alternative School (grades 8-12) (urban)
School divisions: Hopewell City and Prince George County Public Schools
Address: 113 North 12th
Hopewell, VA 23860
Telephone: 804/541-2377
Contact person: Alan Hoover
Brief description: The alternative school for at-risk students provides regular classes, group discussions, individual counseling, and clean-up activities.

Louisa Alternative Program (LEAP) (grades 7-12) (rural)
School division: Louisa County Public Schools
Address: Louisa Middle School
P. O. Box 7
Mineral, VA 23117
Telephone: 703/894-5115
Contact person: Ann Wickwire
Brief description: The LEAP program provides small classes with both academic and vocational focus, emphasizing reading/language arts, consumer math, and vocational areas.

Pregnant Teen Evening Program (grades 8-12) (suburban/rural)
School division: Prince William County Public Schools
Address: P. O. Box 389
Manassas, VA 22110
Telephone: 703/791-7257
Contact person: Irene Campbell, Alternative Education Coordinator
Brief description: Pregnant students in Prince William County's program attend classes three nights a week, with two nights devoted to classes in English, math, science, and social studies, and the third to a peer support group with informal discussions and programs on prenatal care, infant care, child development, and community resources. This is a voluntary program.

Alternative Education Program (grades 8-11) (rural)

School division: Patrick County Public Schools

Address: Patrick County School Board Office
P. O. Box 346
Stuart, VA 24171
Telephone: 703/694-3163
Contact person: Carolyn Deekens

Brief description: In Patrick County High School's alternative education program, at-risk students are identified, assigned mentor teachers, and attend both regular basic level classes and special small-group and individual counseling sessions. Students are assigned to one of four modules depending upon need.

Secondary

Physical Education Leadership Training (P.E.L.T.) (grades 11-12) (urban)

School division: Norfolk Public Schools
Central Office: Vicki Swecker
800 East City Hall Avenue, Room 908
P. O. Box 1357
Norfolk, VA 23501
Telephone: 804/441-2394

Five school sites:

Address: Booker T. Washington High School
1111 Park Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23504
Telephone: 804/441-2443
Contact persons: Ora Isom and John Milbourne

Address: Granby High School
7101 Granby Street
Norfolk, VA 23505
Telephone: 804/489-8771
Contact person: James W. Wade

Address: Lake Taylor High School
1384 Kempsville Road
Norfolk, VA 23502
Telephone: 804/461-5111, ext. 51
Contact person: Beverly A. Lewis

Address: Maury High School
322 Shirley Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23517
Telephone: 804/441-2611
Contact person: Patricia Panzik

Address: Norview High School
Middleton Place
Norfolk, VA 23513
Telephone: 804/853-4577
Contact person: Lou Anne Alexander

Brief description: In the P.E.L.T. program, at-risk students with leadership qualities receive special training in peer facilitation, as well as in-depth training in health and physical education, then are assigned to specific classroom teachers in elementary, middle, or secondary schools to work with children individually and in groups. Periodic evaluation is integral to the program.

Program Alternative for Student Success (PASS) (grades 9-12) (urban)

School division: Norfolk Public Schools

School sites: Booker T. Washington, Granby, and Lake Taylor High Schools

Address: School Administration Building
P. O. Box 1357
Norfolk, VA 23501
Telephone: 804/441-2640
Contact person: Pamela C. Kloeppel, Director of Guidance

Brief description: The fulltime PASS program provides academic classes with small numbers of students and caring teachers, a counselor for each 70 students providing weekly counseling individually or in small groups, intramural basketball for the three sites, and a daily class period on career guidance and employability.

Bibliography

Appalachian Regional Commission. "Appalachian State Dropout Definitions and Attendance Requirements." Excerpted from *Study of High School Dropouts in Appalachia*. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC: Author, May 1985.

Appalachian Regional Commission. "Appalachian Regional Commission Dropout Prevention Program." Washington, D. C.: Author, 1987.

Ascher, Carol; Riehl, Carolyn; and Price, Adam. "Trends and Issues in Urban Education, A Student-Based Perspective." *ERIC/CUE Trends and Issues Series*, No. 5, September 1986.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. "Issue: What Kinds of Programs Can Districts Develop to Meet the Needs of At-Risk Students?" *ASCD Update*, Vol. 28, No. 8, November 1986.

Branch, Alvia Y.; Miller, Julita; and Bloom, Susan. "Summer Training and Education Program (STEP): Report on the Pilot Experience." Philadelphia, PA: *Public/Private Ventures*, April 1986.

Brooks-Gunn, J.; Furstenberg, Frank F.; and Morgan, S. Philip. *Adolescent Mothers in Later Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Catterall, James S. "On the Social Costs of Dropping Out of School." Los Angeles: University of California, December 1985.

Catterall, James S. "School Dropouts: Policy Prospects." Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., November 1986.

Center for National Policy Review. *Jobs Watch Alert*. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, August 13, 1984.

Center on Evaluation, Development, Research. *Hot Topics Series—Child Abuse, Drug Abuse, Teenage Pregnancy, Dropouts* . Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1987.

"Changing Demographics Highlight Need for Focus on Disadvantaged Youth." *Education Daily*, Vol. 19, No. 210, October 31, 1986.

Children's Defense Fund. "Summer Programs Help Disadvantaged Youths To Learn and Grow." *CDF Reports*, July 1986.

Clark, Reginald M. *Family Life and School Achievement: Why Poor Black Children Succeed or Fail*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

"Coca Cola Valued Youth Partnership Program: Results of Second Year Interim Evaluation." *Intercultural Development Research Association Newsletter* , May 1986.

Committee for Economic Development, Research and Policy Committee. *Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged*. New York, NY: Author, 1987.

Council of Chief State School Officers. "Assuring Success for Students At Risk" (CCSSO Policy Statement), "Children at Risk: The Work of the States," "Model State Statute." Washington, D. C.: Resource Center on Educational Equity, Council of Chief State School Officers, 1987.

Council of the Great City Schools. *Challenges to Urban Education: Results in the Making*. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1987.

Doss Willis, Harriet. "Students at Risk: A Review of Conditions, Circumstances, Indicators, and Educational Implications." Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, October 1986.

Earle, Janice; Roach, Virginia; and Fraser, Katherine. "Female Dropouts: A New Perspective." Alexandria, VA: Women's Education Equity Act Project, Youth Services Program, National Association of State Boards of Education, 1987.

"Economic Self-Interest May Fuel School Improvement, Researcher Says." *Education Daily*, Vol. 19, No. 203, October 22, 1986.

Edelman, Marian W.; and Howe, H. "Barriers to Excellence: Our Children At Risk." Boston: National Coalition of Advocates for Students, 1984.

Education Commission of the States. "Dropouts: Left Out and Left Over." *State Education Leader 4*, No. 2, Spring 1984.

Education Commission of the States. *Reconnecting Youth*. Denver, CO: Author.

Educational Testing Service. "Research Tracks Teenage Mothers to Adulthood and Finds Children at Academic Risk." *ETS Developments*, 1987.

Ekstrom, Ruth B.; Goetz, Margaret E.; Pollack, Judith M.; and Rock, Donald A. "Who Drops Out of High School and Why? Findings from a National Study." *Teachers College Record 87*, No. 3, Spring 1986.

"Forty Percent of City's 9th-Graders Drop Out Before Graduating." *Baltimore Sun*, October 26, 1986.

Grossnickle, Donald R. "High School Dropouts: Causes, Consequences, and Cure." Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, *Fastback 242*, 1986.

Hamilton, Stephen F. "Raising Standards and Reducing Dropout Rates." *Teachers College Record 87*, No. 3., Spring 1986.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten through Graduate School." Washington, D. C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc., June 1985.

Holly, William J. "Students' Self-Esteem and Academic Achievement." *Research Roundup*, Vol. 4, No. 1. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals, November 1987.

Hollifield, John H. "Creating Effective Schools for All Students: Implications of Educational Research for Dropout Prevention." Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, November 1985.

Institute for Educational Leadership. "School Dropouts: Everybody's Problem." Washington, D. C.: Author, 1986.

Lambert, Roger; Novak, Jan; and Dougherty, Barbara. *Staying In: A Dropout Prevention Handbook K-12*. Madison, WI: Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin.

Lanier, Mark W. "Educational Excellence and Potential Dropouts: Theory, Research, and Policy Implications." Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., November 1986.

Levin, Henry M. "Educational Reform for Disadvantaged Students: An Emerging Crisis." Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1986.

Levin, Henry M. "The Educationally Disadvantaged: A National Crisis." Philadelphia, PA: Center for State Youth Initiatives of Public/Private Ventures, July 1985.

Mann, Dale. "Can We Help Dropouts? Thinking About the Undoable." *Teachers College Record 87*, No. 3, Spring 1986.

National Center on Effective Secondary Schools. *Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 1. Madison, WI: Author, Fall 1986.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education. "High Student Dropout Rate Inspires New Programs." *Centergram*, October 1986.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education. *Education and Employment, Research for the Practitioner Series.* Columbus, OH: Author, August 1985.

National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics. *Make Something Happen: Hispanics and Urban High School Reform.* Two volumes. New York: Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1984.

National Education Association. "Trends." *NEA Today*, December 1987.

National Education Association Study Groups on Ethnic Minority Concerns. *...And Justice for All.* Washington: National Education Association, 1987.

National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. "Principles for Dropout Prevention: A Blueprint for Success." Washington, D. C.: Author, 1986.

Natriello, Gary; Pallas, Aaron M.; and McDill, Edward L. "Community Resources for Responding to the Dropout Problem." Paper prepared for the Public Relations Institute, Rutgers University, August 1986.

Nelson, Erik. "Dropout Prevention." Digest prepared for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1985.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. *Joining Hands: The Report of the Model Programs for Dropout Prevention.* Raleigh, NC: Author, December 1986.

Novak, Jan; Wehlage, Nancy; and Wang, Eleanor. *The Education/Work Connection: Effective Programming for Youth.* Madison, WI: Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin, March 1981.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education. *Dealing with Dropouts: The Urban Superintendents' Call to Action.* Washington, D. C.: Author, November 1987.

Orr, Margaret T. *Keeping Students in School.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1987.

Pallas, Aaron M.; and Verdugo, Richard R. "Measuring the High School Dropout Problem." Washington, D. C.: Center for Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, April 1986.

Pittman, Karen. "Preventing Adolescent Pregnancy: What Schools Can Do." Washington, D. C.: Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Clearinghouse, Children's Defense Fund, September 1986.

Pittman, Karen; and Govan, Carrie. "Model Programs: Preventing Adolescent Pregnancy and Building Youth Self-Sufficiency." Washington, D. C.: Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Clearinghouse, Children's Defense Fund, July 1986.

Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands. "The Cutting Edge: New R & D Products (available through the network of Regional Educational Laboratories): Serving At-Risk Youth." Andover, MA: Author, May 1987.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. "Summary of Discussions at the Meeting on Problems of Students At Risk, hosted by the Pennsylvania Department of Education on March 26, 1987." Philadelphia, PA: Author, April 1987.

Rist, Marilee C. "Students At Risk." *American School Board Journal*, October 1987.

Rumberger, Russell W. "High School Dropouts: The Influence of Race, Sex, and Family Background." *American Educational Research Journal 20*, Summer 1983.

Strickland, Dorothy S.; and Cooper, Eric J. (Eds.). *Educating Black Children: America's Challenge.* Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, Howard University, 1987.

"Take Risks, and Save Teens." *American School Board Journal*, April 1986.

"Teenagers Who Work: The Lessons of After-School Employment." *Harvard Education Letter*, Vol. II, No. 5, September 1986.

U. S. Government Accounting Office. "School Dropouts: The Extent and Nature of the Problem." *Briefing Report to Congressional Requestors*, GAO/HRD 86-106BR, June 1986.

U. S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. "Two Years After High School: A Capsule Description of 1980 Sophomores." Washington, D. C.: Author, September 1986.

Wehlage, Gary G.; and Rutter, Robert R. "Dropping Out: How Much Do Schools Contribute to the Problem?" *Teachers College Record 87*, No. 3, Spring 1986.

William T. Grant Foundation—Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship. *The Forgotten Half: Noncollege Youth in America*. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1988.

Youth Policy. Vol. 8, No. 3, March 1986.

Curriculum References

Brenner, E. *When Baby Comes Home.* Hayward, CA 94545: Janus Book Publishers (2501 Industrial Parkway West), 1984.

Canter, L. and M. *Assertive Discipline: A Take Charge Approach for Today's Educator.* Santa Monica, CA: Canter & Associates, 1976.

Foster, E. S. *Tutoring: Learning by Helping.* Raleigh, NC 27601: NC Reprographics, Inc. (P. O. Box 25921), 1981.

Gibbs, J.; and Allen, A. *Tribes: A Process for Peer Involvement.* Santa Rosa, CA 95402: Center-Source Publications (P. O. Box 436).

Growth and Development, Middle and Upper Grades. Waterloo, IA: McDonald Publishers, 1981.

Howard, B.; and Brainard, E. *Handbook for Conducting School Climate Projects.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1987.

Kite, Dr. R. H. "Toward an Explanation of Dropout." *The Urban Educator*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1987.

Myrick, R.; and Erney, T. *Caring and Sharing: Becoming a Peer Facilitator.* Minneapolis, MN 55421: Educational Media Corporation (P. O. Box 21311), 1978.

Myrick, R.; and Erney, T. *Youth Helping Youth: A Handbook for Training Peer Facilitators.* Minneapolis, MN 55421: Educational Media Corporation (P. O. Box 21311).

The American Forestry Association. *PLT—Project Learning Tree.* Washington, D.C.: Author, 1988.

Virginia Department of Education, Division of Vocational and Adult Education. *Competency-Based Instructional Units for Teenage Parenting.* Richmond, VA 23216. (Telephone: 804/262-7439)

Wolfgang, C. H.; and Glickman, C. D. *Solving Discipline Problems: Strategies for Classroom Teachers.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1986.

Resources List [1]

Source	Resource
National Center on Effective Secondary Schools School of Education University of Wisconsin Madison, WI 53706	* Model Comprehensive Program * Evaluation Instrument
Research Triangle Institute P. O. Box 12194 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	* "High School Dropouts in Appalachia: Problems and Palliatives," by J. L. Cox and R. Spivey, 1986.
Appalachian Regional Commission 1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20235	* $2.2 million in recently funded dropout projects
70001, Ltd. 600 West Sixth Avenue, SW Suite 300 Washington, DC 20024	* More than 50 projects in 16 states. Work skills, GED training.
SEEDCO 130 West 42nd Street New York, NY 10036	* Report to the Carnegie Corporation, "What Do We Do About Youth Dropouts? A Sourcebook of Solutions," 1986.
James S. Catterall (author) UCLA Graduate School of Education Los Angeles, CA 90024	* Sample Evaluation *"On the Social Costs of Dropping Out of School," 1986.
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education 1201 16th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036	* "A Blueprint for Success." Report of nationwide collaboration on dropout prevention principles and strategies. Includes numerous references to organization activities and information exchanges.

[1] The source of this list is Catterall, James S. (1986) cited in Bibliography, p. 17.

State Department of Education Contacts

In AEL's Region, the State Department of Education contacts regarding programs for at-risk students or dropout prevention are as follows:

State Department of Education	Contact
Kentucky Department of Education	David Jackson, 502/564-4770
Tennessee Department of Education	Anna Blackman, 615/741-0725
Virginia Department of Education	Richard Levy, 804/225-2050
West Virginia Department of Education	Terri Wilson, 304/348-7826

APPENDICES

March 1, 1988

Appalachia Educational Laboratory

Dear

The Virginia Education Association and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory, a nonprofit provider of educational research and development information, are collaborating on their third study group. This group of seven Virginia teachers and guidance counselors, representing elementary, middle, and high school levels, is examining programs of assistance for at-risk students. Group members plan to develop a guide to effective programs for at-risk students (K-12) currently operating in Virginia schools. The guide will be made available to educators in Virginia through VEA, and AEL will announce and disseminate the publication in Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia.

As chairperson of Region Study Group No. VII, we invite your participation in the identification of schools for inclusion in the study. Each regional chairperson is asked to discuss the project at the next study group meeting and then to nominate three schools from each level (elementary, middle, and high school) in the region where effective programs of assistance to at-risk students are currently operating. You may wish to provide copies of the enclosed project information sheet to study group members.

Enclosed is a form requesting the school name, principal's name, and program title or area of concern for each of the nine schools. After completion at the March study group meeting, please fold, staple, and return the postage-paid form to AEL. Responses should be received by April 1.

Study group members will phone the principals of identified schools to learn of contact persons for the programs and will mail a brief written program description/survey form to each contact to be completed and returned. Each contact person may also receive a followup phone call from a study group member for further clarification of information provided.

Study group members will then analyze data provided and develop the guide, which should be available in October. Some data will be aggregated. Where identifying information is reported, school contact persons will be given the right of review prior to publication.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
1031 Quarrier Street / P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston, West Virginia 25325 • (304) 347-0400
An Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

AEL and VEA staff and study group members are hoping for the participation of members of each regional study group and the inclusion of schools from each region in the final publication. Each participating contact person and regional study group chair will receive copies of the guide. Should you need further information prior to discussing the project with your colleagues, please contact Jane or Helen at the numbers provided below. Thank you for your assistance on an educational project with importance to educators in Virginia and throughout the region.

Sincerely,

Jane Hange

Jane Hange, Director
AEL Classroom Instruction Program
800/624-9120

Helen Rolfe

Helen Rolfe, Director
VEA Instruction and
Professional Development
804/648-5801

VEA-AEL Study Group Members:

Joanne Branton
Caroline County Public Schools

Dale Brittle
Caroline County Public Schools

Carolyn Cummings
Richmond City Schools

Eva DePue
Caroline County Public Schools

Joe Gilreath
Richmond City Schools

Sherrell Sherron
Chesterfield County Public Schools

Clover Willis
Richmond City Schools

JH:HR:sjk

Enclosures

Appalachia Educational Laboratory

VEA-AEL EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS STUDY

A study group of teachers sponsored by the VEA and AEL are developing a guide to effective programs of assistance for at-risk students. We would like to include nine schools from Region Study Group No. I. To help in the identification of such programs, we ask that you nominate three schools from each level--elementary, middle, and high school--within your divisions that currently operate effective programs of assistance or dropout prevention.

We expect the guide to network educators interested in better serving at-risk students with educators who coordinate effective programs. Programs described in the guide should have target student populations with characteristics such as the following at-risk factors:

- one or more retentions in grade
- poor atttendance
- low basic skills test scores
- English as a second language
- poor interpersonal relationships
- victims of neglect or abuse
- identification for exceptional education services
- poor home-school relationships
- low academic success
- low self-esteem
- pregnancy or children
- one parent or guardian
- low education level of parent(s)
- substance abuse problem--personal or parental
- low socioeconomic status

Since only nine schools per region can be included, it is important that programs identified have some measure of program effectiveness such as (but not limited to): improved attendance, standardized test scores, or grades of target students; lower dropout rate; increased parental involvement; or fewer discipline referrals or suspensions for target students. The program description/survey will ask contact persons to describe effectiveness measures and results.

As you know, Virginia divisions serve a wide variety of communities, and at-risk students are present in all types of communities. For this reason, we ask that you consider nominating one rural, one suburban, and one urban program for each level (elementary, middle, and high school) if appropriate for the divisions in your region.

Please complete the attached nominating form in the March meeting of your regional study group, fold, staple, and return it to AEL by April 1.

Thank you for your assistance. Contact persons in participating schools will receive a copy of the guide as will the chair of each regional study group. Additional guides will be available from VEA and AEL in October.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
1031 Quarrier Street / P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston, West Virginia 25325 • (304) 347-0400
An Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer

EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS GUIDE
SCHOOL NOMINATING FORM

Region Study Group No. ____
Name of Chairperson _____

Please print or type all responses.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NAME	PROGRAM TYPE (or title)	COMMUNITY TYPE (urban, suburban, rural)	PRINCIPAL'S NAME

MIDDLE SCHOOL NAME	PROGRAM TYPE	COMMUNITY TYPE	PRINCIPAL'S NAME

HIGH SCHOOL NAME	PROGRAM TYPE	COMMUNITY TYPE	PRINCIPAL'S NAME

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING PROGRAMS IN NAMED SCHOOLS:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. PLEASE FOLD, STAPLE, AND MAIL THIS FORM TO AEL AT THE ADDRESS ON THE BACK.

APPENDIX II

Survey Form

VEA-AEL Survey of Programs for At-Risk Students

I. School and Program Demographics

Title of program: _____

School division: _____

School name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Telephone number: _____

Program contact person: _____

Type of community served: (Please check as many as apply.)

urban ____ suburban ____ rural ____

II. Target Students

Number of students served in program: _____

Age range of target students: _____

Grade levels of target students: _____

By what criteria are project students selected? (Please check as many as apply.)

____ One or more retentions in grade

____ Poor attendance

____ Low basic skills test scores

____ English as a second language

____ Poor interpersonal relationships

____ Victims of neglect or abuse

____ Identification for exceptional educational services

____ Poor home-school relationships

____ Low academic success

____ Low self-esteem

____ Pregnancy or teenage parent

____ One parent or guardian

____ Low education level of parent(s)

____ Substance abuse--personal

____ parental

____ Low socioeconomic status

____ Other (Please describe.):

_____

_____

III. **Program Staff**

	Fulltime	Parttime
Number of professional staff:	_____	_____
Number of other staff:	_____	_____

IV. **Program Funding**

Approximate annual program cost: _____

Source(s) of funding: _____

_____

V. **Program Description**

A. Purpose/Goals/Objectives: (Please check all appropriate categories and describe any others.)

____ To improve attendance

____ To improve the academic performance of at-risk students

____ To lower the dropout rate

____ To increase parental involvement

____ To increase community involvement

____ To decrease discipline referrals

____ To decrease suspensions

____ To increase English proficiency

____ To keep pregnant students/ parents in school

____ To improve students' self-esteem

____ To improve students' self-discipli

____ To provide vocational counseling/ counseling/assistance

____ To decrease substance abuse and provide assistance to substance abusers

____ Other: (Please describe.)

_____

_____

B. Size of classes or student group(s): _____

C. Length of instruction or intervention sessions (number of hours per day and number of days per week for a typical student): _____

D. Outside resources and support persons used:

E. Major program activities: (Please list briefly. You may also attach any prepared) program descriptions to supplement your response.)

F. Commercial or project-developed curriculum materials used: (Please list titles and publishers of commercial, authors if project developed.)

G. In what school year was the program first implemented? _____

VI. Staff Development

A. Content:

B. Processes:

C. Number of sessions: _____

D. Staff involved:

E. Followup:

F. Other:

VII. Measures of Program Effectiveness

A. Which of the following measures of effectiveness has the program achieved? (Please check as many as appropriate, report results, and describe any not listed below.)

Measure	Result (percentage where appropriate)
1. Improved attendance	____
2. Improved standardized test scores	____
3. Improved criterion-referenced test scores	____
4. Improved grades of target students	____
5. Lower dropout rate	____
6. Fewer discipline referrals	____
7. Fewer suspensions	____
8. Case histories (Please describe below.)	____
9. Increased parental involvement	____
10. Project-developed evaluation form(s) (Please enclose a copy.)	____
11. Other: (Please describe.)	

B. Are written reports available? For which results? (Please provide titles, authors, and dates.)

C. What percentage of students has withdrawn from the program during the current school year without completing it? _____

What are the most commonly cited reasons for student withdrawal?

VIII. Greatest Accomplishment

(Describe a brief case history of one particularly successful student or outline the most effective program strategy.)

IX. Future of Program

A. Will the program be continued next year? Yes ____ No ____

Why or why not?

B. What improvements in the program are planned?

Return to AEL, P. O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325, if submitting a program for future inclusion.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory

Study Group Product Assessment Form

A. Background

1. Name of Product: **Helping Hands: Effective Programs for At-Risk Students in Virginia**
2. Name: _____
3. School/District: _____
4. Type of Job You Hold: _____
5. State: _____

B. If you work with an effective program not reported here,we invite you to fill out the survey questionnaire in Appendix II and return it to AEL for possible inclusion in a later edition.

C. Rating

This instrument asks you to evaluate this particular product on a series of product quality scales. Please mark your responses with an "X" (corresponding to your answer) at any point along the scale provided. If you cannot reply to any scale, please check the "Cannot Reply" option for that item.

1. How easy was it for you to get this material?
   ___ Cannot Reply

   Difficult ——— Very Easy

   0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50

2. How clearly presented was the information in this material?
   ___ Cannot Reply

   Unclear ——— Very Clear

   0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50

3. How credible was the information in this material?
   ___ Cannot Reply

   Unbelievable ——— Very Believable

   0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50

4. How useful was the information in this material?
   ___ Cannot Reply

   Not Useful ——— Very Useful

   0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50

5. Which sections of the report have you found helpful? Please explain briefly how these sections helped you.

Please turn to back

6. What changes would make the report more valuable?

7. How did you learn of the availability of this report?

8. Have you shared your copy with other educators? If so, how many?

Thank you for completing this evaluation/contribution form.
Please fold, staple, stamp, and mail to AEL.

Affix
Postage
Here

AEL

P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325